



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/073,635 | 02/11/2002 | Anders Lundh | P14918-US1-PURA | 5431 |

7590 11/03/2004
STEVEN B. PHILLIPS MOORE & VAN ALLEN
SUITE 800
2200 WEST MAIN STREET
DURHAM, NC 27705

EXAMINER

APPIAH, CHARLES NANA

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2686

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/073,635

Applicant(s)

LUNDH ET AL.

Examiner

Charles Appiah

Art Unit

2686

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 5, "the address information" on line 6 lacks prior antecedent basis in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Miller (5,434,845)** in view of **Abdo et al. (6,442,239)**.

Regarding claims 1 and 5, Miller discloses (see Figs. 4 and 7), a device for use in acquiring address information at a link in a telecommunication network, the device comprising: a connection for the telecommunication network (see col. 3, line 54 to col. 4, line 15), a processing system operable to receive a data stream through the connection (see col. 4, lines 16-28), and determine the address information contained in the data stream based on the occurrence of a flag in a message signal unit (line trace displaying origin and destination of frame containing message service unit, see col. 5,

lines 3-25) and a display operatively connected to the processing system, the display operable to display the address information (see col. 5, lines 20-30). Miller fails to explicitly teach an arrangement for supplying power to the display and the processing system from a self-contained power source. According to Miller, the device is capable of receiving and storing communication frames for off-line analysis and is portable and operable in any mode (see col. 3, lines 5-9).

Abdo discloses a battery-operated portable test device for a telephone technician to use in performing a variety of tests on a telephone line (see col. 3, lines 51-67, Fig. 1).

It would therefore have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to have a self-contained power source such a battery as taught by Abdo to power Miller's device in order to have a portable, versatile and self-powered device capable of being used in any mode.

Regarding claim 2, Miller further discloses wherein the address information comprises: an origination point code and a destination point code (see col. 5, lines 21-25).

Regarding claims 3 and 6, Miller further discloses wherein the processing system is further operable to determine an application part based on a specified field within the MSU wherein the display is further operable to display the application part (service information octet, see col. 5, lines 3-27).

Regarding claim 4, Miller further discloses wherein the MSU is a signaling system 7 (SS7) MSU (see col. 3, lines 51-53).

4. Claims 5-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Miller (5,434,845)** in view of **Spangler et al. (6,327,350)**

Regarding claims 5, 7, 8 and 11, Miller discloses a method and an apparatus for presenting address information at a link in a telecommunication network, the method comprising: receiving a data stream (see col. 4, lines 16-28), detecting the occurrence of a flag in the stream, the flag indicating a beginning of a MSU contained within the data stream (see col. 4, lines 55-56, Figs. 3A and 3B), collecting address bits based on a positioning of the address bits within the MSU relative to the flag (see col. 5, lines 3-12). Miller further teaches the capability of determining and displaying the address information (see col. 5, lines 3-27), but fails to specifically teach parsing the address bits to determine the address information wherein the parsing of the address bits is accomplished at least in part by determining an origination point code and a destination point code contained within the address information.

Spangler discloses a method and system for collecting and processing SS7 Message Signaling Units that include the use of a parser to extract parameter required for call detail records (CDR) generation including having a routing label that includes an origination point code and a destination point code (see col. 7, line 40 to col. 8, line 8).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Spangler by providing a parser to Miller's device in order to be able to extract desired communication signal parameters such as are needed for call detail record processing as taught by Spangler.

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Miller and Spangler further discloses means to determine and display an application part as taught by Miller (see col. 5, lines 21-30).

Regarding claim 8, the combination of Miller and Spangler as taught by Spangler further discloses wherein the parsing of the address bits is accomplished at least in part by determining an origination point code and a destination point code contained within the address information (see col. 7, line 40 to col. 8, line 8).

Regarding claims 9 and 12, Miller further discloses displaying the application part (see col. 5, lines 21-30), while Spangler further discloses collecting application part bits from a specified field within the MSU and determining an application part based on the application part bits (see Figs. 10(a), 10(b), col. 8, lines 21-25, col. 10, lines 22-67).

Regarding claim 10, Miller further discloses wherein the MSU is a SS7 MSU (see col. 3, lines 51-53, col. 4, lines 53-54) and Spangler also discloses the MSU is a signaling system seven (SS7) MSU (see col. 7, lines 40-54).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Gantner et al. (5,566,182) discloses an ISDN message processing system.

Kahkoska (6,064,372) discloses a touch screen graphical user interface test instrument.


Aridas et al. (5,579,371) discloses a system for processing SS7 and CCS related applications on a network platform.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Appiah whose telephone number is 703 305-4772. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on 703 305-4379. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CA


CHARLES APPIAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER